

Application No.: 10/522,059  
Amendment Dated July 13, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of March 13, 2009

MAT-8640US

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Yamazaki (US 2002/0132047) and Spahn (US 6,237,529). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Page 9, line 25 of Applicants' specification explains that generated vapor flow 38e is deposited on the surface of substrate 13. Applicants' Fig. 2 shows that the vapor flow forms protective layer 18 on the bottom of the substrate.

Page 11, line 11 of Applicants' specification states:

...a proportion of the deposition material passing through opening 4 of substrate holder 1 reaches and deposits on non-deposition face 13b of substrate 13. However, protrusion 5...suppresses this phenomenon.

Thus, Applicants' claim 1 now recites the feature of:

...an unobstructed path exists from said source of deposition material to a top surface of said substrate...

Yamazaki was cited in the outstanding office action as teaching a protrusion that extends to a height above Yamazaki's substrate. This protrusion appears in Fig. 1 of Yamazaki. This protrusion, however, creates an obstruction between his source of deposition material and the top surface of his substrate. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not rely on Yamazaki to obtain Applicants' claim 1.

Spahn was also cited in the outstanding office action as teaching a protrusion that extends to a height above Spahn's substrate. Applicants respectfully disagree as Fig. 4 of Spahn appears to show protrusions that extend only below his substrate (i.e. not above). In addition, Spahn's protrusions 104 create obstructions between his source of deposition material and the top surface of his substrate. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not rely on Spahn to obtain Applicants' claim 1.

Application No.: 10/522,059  
Amendment Dated July 13, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of March 13, 2009

MAT-8640US

Applicants' admitted prior art lacks any teaching of Applicants' claimed protrusion. That is why the rejection attempted to combine the admitted prior art with other references.

Accordingly, the combination of references cited in the outstanding office action neither discloses nor suggests Applicants' claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4, while not identical to claim 1 is also patentable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 2, 5 and 8 are patentable by virtue of the dependency on allowable claims 1 and 4.

In view of the arguments set forth above, allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 6, 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by combining applicants' admitted prior art, Yamazaki, and Spahn with other references of record. These claims, however, are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, this application is

Application No.: 10/522,059  
Amendment Dated July 13, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of March 13, 2009

MAT-8640US

in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/dmw

Dated: July 13, 2009

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

NM420789

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby  
authorized to charge payment to Deposit  
Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated  
with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent  
and Trademark Office on July 13, 2009.



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515